DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 211 019 HE 014 680

AUTHOR Bell, David P.
TITLE A National Study of Upper-Level Institutions. AASCU Studies, 1981/2.
INSTITUTION American Association of State Colleges and Universities, Washington, D.C.
REPORT NO ISBN-0-88044-058-9
PUB DATE Sep 81
NOTE 34p.
AVAILABLE FROM American Association of State Colleges and Universities, Suite 700, One Dupont Circle, Washington, DC 20036.

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Education; Adult Students; *Articulation (Education); College Planning; College Programs; *College Role; Educational Philosophy; Educational Trends; Enrollment Trends; Higher Education; *Intercollegiate Cooperation; National Surveys; Nontraditional Students; School Surveys; Statewide Planning; Trend Analysis; *Upper Division Colleges
IDENTIFIERS *Florida; Illinois; *Texas

ABSTRACT

The role and function of upper-level higher education institutions, their current health, and their future prospects are considered, based on a national study. Data were gathered on nearly all of the 25 upper-level institutions in the United States, and site visits were conducted at approximately half. These schools offer work at only the junior, senior, and possibly postgraduate levels. Attention was directed to the unique philosophical and operational considerations that guide these colleges; factors surrounding the creation, planning, and opening of the institutions; the nature of the relationships with nearby two-year colleges, particularly regarding articulation of academic programs; the demographic composition of services; the academic mission and programmatic offerings of the upper-level institutions; and budgetary and financial considerations. Over half of the schools are in Texas and Florida, with Illinois being the only other state with more than one upper-level institution. In Texas, the upper-level idea was proposed as part of a unified state plan, while in Florida they were created individually, in response to the state need for additional institutions of higher education in the heavily populated urban areas of the state. With only a few exceptions, the upper-level institutions created in the 1960s and 1970s were designed to interface with pre-existing two-year institutions. Upper-level institutions have focused their resources and energy on meeting the special needs of nontraditional students: those who are older, employed, married, part-time, and place-bound. In addition these institutions have developed professionally-oriented curricula and well-developed placement offices. The need to articulate with other schools at both the lower division and doctoral levels is one of the more severe burdens faced by upper-level institutions. (SW)

ED211019

SCUPIES

1981/2

A National Study of Upper-Level Institutions

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

AASCU

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

HE 014 680

American Association of
State Colleges and Universities

A NATIONAL STUDY OF UPPER-LEVEL INSTITUTIONS

David P. Bell
Coordinator of Academic Planning
University of Houston System

AASCU STUDIES 1981/2

September 1981

Allan W. Ostar
President

© 1981 by American Association of State Colleges and Universities
One Dupont Circle/Suite 700
Washington, DC 20036

Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication Data

Bell, David P.
A National Study of Upper-Level Institutions.

(AASCU Studies; 1981/2)
1. Community colleges—United States. 2. Universities and colleges—United States. I. Title. II. Series.
LB2329.5.A43 1981/2 [LB2328] 378'.052 81-69239
ISBN 0-88044-058-9 AACR2
ISSN: 0278-4130

The opinions and recommendations in this book are those of the author and are not intended to represent the official policy of the American Association of State Colleges and Universities.

CONTENTS

Foreword

1 Preface

2 Introduction

6 Origin of Upper-Level Institutions

9 Student Characteristics and Services

13 Academic Issues

- Articulation with Two-Year Institutions
- Balance Between Innovative and Traditional Approaches
- Addition of a Lower Division

18 Budgetary and Financial Considerations

21 Summary and Prospects

24 Appendix—Statistical Profile of Upper-Level Institutions

- Section A—General Information
- Section B—Student Data
- Section C—Faculty Data
- Section D—Budget Data

FOREWORD

Nothing in Academe ever stands still! Thus it is time to have a look at the current status of the movement to develop upper-level institutions in the United States to complement the burgeoning junior colleges.

When Robert Altman published his study "The Upper-Division College" in 1970, he could focus only on what was established at that point, and as a result the study was limited. Many of the flourishing upper-level institutions, especially in Texas, Illinois, and Florida were established since his book appeared.

Now the pendulum is swinging in the other direction. Bills have appeared in various legislatures to turn upper-level institutions into traditional four-year colleges, with graduate units. Many of the reasons for which certain states developed the upper-level concept in their systems have been forgotten, as personnel turnover fades memories. Faculties who flocked to the innovative institutions that happened to have no freshmen and sophomores are searching for the traditional benchmarks of departmental and disciplinary organization. Statewide boards object to the "sudden" finding that it costs more to present junior and senior classes to 15-30 students taught by fully-prepared professors than it does to combine the costs with lower-division lectures filled with hundreds of freshmen quizzed by teaching fellows. The student who completes his junior college work in the upper-level university is overshadowed by the college stop-out who, in a new location and at a later stage in life, finds an academic home in a very different type of institution where the average age is over 30 and the typical student is at mid-career and climbing, seriously and earnestly.

David Bell's study takes a look at these upper-level institutions at a point in their history when they are turning from innovation toward tradition, when each is reexamining its purposes, its mission, its place in the educational community. Can they accept lower-division students and still be the community universities that most of them were in their founding? Should they strive to become research institutions? Should they merge with the vocationally-oriented junior college near them? Are the demographic circumstances of their locations such that their very existence needs to be reviewed? And what really are the basic common characteristics of this type of school and does it have a continuing place in Academe?

At a point in time when, in instance after instance, the founding chief administrators of these upper-level schools are yielding their posts to a new generation of presidents and chancellors, when their initial idealism makes way for the pragmatic survival instincts of the second wave of institutional executives, a study of this type is most appropriate, and should be welcome. The upper-level university is not simply a school without freshmen and sophomores, it is a different type of entity, with a different ambience and constituency. It is hoped that Dr. Bell's study will help in the understanding of this relatively rare breed of institution.

Alfred R. Neumann, Chancellor
University of Houston at Clear Lake City (Founded 1971)
Chairman, AASCU Committee on Upper-Level Institutions

PREFACE

This national study of upper-level institutions represents the culmination of a two-year effort by the Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs, University of Houston System. As a system with two upper-level campuses in a state with ten such institutions, the University of Houston sought to investigate the unique philosophical and operational considerations that guide these colleges. Extensive data were gathered on nearly all of the twenty-five upper-level institutions in the United States today, and site visits were conducted at approximately half. It is hoped that this study will provide the reader with a clear picture of the current status and future viability of the upper-level movement in the United States.

The author wishes to express his appreciation to the leadership of the University of Houston for its support of this study. Gratitude is also expressed to the numerous administrators and faculty at the various institutions who provided information and arranged visitations. Finally, specific acknowledgment is given to Joseph E. Champagne, President of Oakland University and former Vice President for Academic Affairs of the University of Houston, for his overall guidance, and to Nanette Darby, for her secretarial support.

INTRODUCTION

The American higher education enterprise is frequently described in terms of its decentralized character. This argument usually begins by noting the absence of a Ministry of Higher Education in the United States as well as any type of federal system of colleges and universities. Public higher education is primarily a state function, with no two states precisely alike in the organization and governance of their collegiate institutions. Finally, the autonomy of individual institutions (and multi-campus systems) is reflected in the fact that they are typically governed by separate, semi-independent Boards of Regents or Trustees, thus lending further strength to the notion of decentralization.

Against this backdrop of decentralization, it is surprising to observe that American higher education has spawned relatively few types of institutions. For all the potential diversity that could have emerged, only a handful of distinct structural types have indeed developed. The Carnegie Council offered in 1976 a classification scheme that divided the over 3,000 institutions in the United States into six categories:[1]

Type	Number
Doctorate-granting institutions	184
Comprehensive universities and colleges	594
Liberal arts colleges	583
Two-year institutions	1,147
Professional schools and other specialized institutions	560
Institutions for non-traditional study	6
TOTAL	3,074

Given that one could reasonably collapse the first two categories under the "comprehensive" rubric, plus the negligible number of institutions in the last group, the Carnegie taxonomy can be reduced to four basic categories, a meager number in light of the diversity that characterizes America and its institutions.

In this context, then, the upper-level or upper-division institution represents a departure from the previously identified categories. An upper-level institution is one that offers course work at only the junior, senior, and in some cases post-graduate levels Since only two of these institutions—the University of Texas at Dallas and Florida Atlantic University—offer the doctorate, the upper-level school, by and large, carves its territory out of the vast intermediate domain of higher education—baccalaureate and masters level education. Indeed, as shall be noted in detail later, the necessity of articulating with other institutions at both the front (lower division) and back (doctoral) ends constitutes one of the more severe burdens borne by upper-level institutions.

The history of the upper-level movement can be traced back more than a century to the University of Georgia, where in 1859 the Board of Trustees created a "Collegiate Institution" that included only the junior and senior years.[2] The outbreak of the Civil War caused a sharp enrollment decline, and this first upper-level institution lasted only two-and-a-half years. This experiment was followed by similar attempts to "bisect the baccalaureate"

during the latter part of the nineteenth century at the Universities of Minnesota and Chicago. The period between 1935 and 1960 witnessed the creation of several upper-level institutions, such as the College of the Pacific and the Flint and Dearborn campuses of the University of Michigan. Robert Altman, in a volume entitled *The Upper Division College*, provides a rich sense of detail concerning these early institutions by comprehensively reconstructing the educational issues, historical forces, and the actions of the primary characters that shaped this era of the upper-level movement.[3]

Interestingly, not a single institution created before 1960 as an upper-level institution has managed to persist until the present time in that form. That single fact, which conveniently divides the upper-level movement into an early and a modern period, provides the rationale for the present study. Depending on the criteria for inclusion that one employs, there are approximately twenty-five upper-level institutions currently operating in the United Stat , the oldest having been created in 1964. This investigation seeks to analyze the unique philosophical and operational considerations that guide these colleges and furthermore attempts to assess the present and future viability of the upper-level movement. Questions to be examined include the factors surrounding the creation, planning, and opening of the institutions; the nature of the relationships with nearby two-year colleges, particularly regarding articulation of academic programs; the demographic composition of the various student bodies, with the resulting special need for various student services; the academic mission and programmatic offerings of the upper-level institutions; and budgetary and financial considerations. Using data collected in a comprehensive questionnaire completed by nearly all of the upper-level institutions in the nation and reinforced by site visits to approximately half of these schools, the study attempts to address the fundamental questions regarding the role and function of these institutions, their current health, and their future prospects.

At the outset, it is useful to provide a roster of the upper-level institutions that constitute the subject of this analysis. Table 1 identifies all currently operating upper-level institutions including those from which data were not received. The table also indicates location, year of opening, and fall 1977 headcount enrollment.

As is evident, the universe of upper-level institutions is quite small, comprising less than one percent of the total number of institutions of higher education and a slightly smaller proportion of the total enrollment. Over half of the schools are in Texas and Florida, with Illinois being the only other state with more than one upper-level institution. Figure 1 reveals the geographic distribution of upper-level institutions.

TABLE 1

Upper-Level Universities in the United States

Institution	Location	Year of Opening	Fall 1977 Headcount
University of Houston at Clear Lake City	Clear Lake City, Texas	1974	4,831
University of Houston Victoria Campus	Victoria, Texas	1973	694
*University of Texas at Dallas	Dallas, Texas	1969	5,329
University of Texas of the Permian Basin	Odessa, Texas	1973	1,575
University of Texas at Tyler	Tyler, Texas	1973	1,795
Corpus Christi State University	Corpus Christi, Texas	1973	2,495
Laredo State University	Laredo, Texas	1970	793
East Texas State University at Texarkana	Texarkana, Texas	1972	1,151
*Sul Ross State University Uvalde Study Center	Uvalde, Texas	1973	589
Pan American University at Brownsville	Brownsville, Texas	1973	1,020
Florida Atlantic University	Boca Raton, Florida	1964	6,917
Florida International University	Miami, Florida	1972	10,687
University of North Florida	Jacksonville, Florida	1972	4,252
University of West Florida	Pensacola, Florida	1967	5,017
University of South Florida Regional Campuses	St. Petersburg, Sarasota, Ft. Myers, Florida	1968	3,025
Governors State University	Park Forest South, Illinois	1971	3,814
Sangamon State University	Springfield, Illinois	1970	3,612
State University of New York College of Technology at Utica/Rome	Utica, New York	1969	2,840
Garfield Senior College	Painesville, Ohio	1971	701
John F. Kennedy University	Orinda, California	1965	880
*University of Baltimore	Baltimore, Maryland	1975	5,474
West Oahu College	Aiea, Hawaii	1976	201
Athens State College	Athens, Alabama	1975	1,314
Penn State Capitol Campus	Middletown, Pennsylvania	1966	2,604
Metropolitan State University	St. Paul, Minnesota	1973	2,024
			73,634

*Data not received

FIGURE 1

Geographic Distribution of Upper-Level Institutions

ORIGIN OF UPPER-LEVEL INSTITUTIONS

The creation of any new institution, whether it be a university, hospital, church, or the like, is an event worthy of examination, in that it reflects the collective energy of many individuals and groups, as well as a significant level of initial resources. This is particularly true when the new institution departs in some fundamental respect from the norms for that type of institution. The upper-level university can be viewed in this context, owing to its structural dissimilarity to other institutions of higher education.

The two states with the greatest number of upper-level institutions–Texas and Florida–reflect quite distinct approaches to the creation of upper-level campuses. In Texas, the Coordinating Board, Texas College and University System, developed a master plan in 1969 that sought to address the statewide needs for higher education for the next decade. In its report, entitled *Challenge for Excellence*, the Coordinating Board called for the creation of six new senior college campuses, four of which were designated to be upper-level institutions.[4] The strategy of building new institutions as opposed to expanding the capacity of existing ones was perceived to be an effective mechanism for enhancing access to higher education for a population spread over a vast area. Acting on this recommendation, the Texas Legislature established the University of Texas at Dallas and the University of Texas of the Permian Basin in 1969 and Texas A & I University at Corpus Christi (since redesignated as Corpus Christi State University) and the University of Houston at Clear Lake City in 1971. The 1971 legislature also created Tyler State College (redesignated first as Texas Eastern University and most recently as the University of Texas at Tyler), based upon a Coordinating Board recommendation that followed shortly after the issuance of *Challenge for Excellence*.

In addition to these five upper-level institutions, a total of five other "upper-level centers" were created by the state during the early 1970s: Texas A & I University at Laredo (since redesignated as Laredo State University), University of Houston Victoria Center, East Texas State University at Texarkana, Pan American University at Brownsville, and Sul Ross State University Uvalde Study Center. These centers were all located on the campuses of local two-year institutions and were conceived as smaller operations with more limited academic scope and less administrative autonomy than the previously identified group of upper-level institutions. An additional distinguishing characteristic was the fact that the upper-level centers (with the Laredo campus being the one exception) were originally established by Coordinating Board recommendation only, and were not followed by legislative action.

The point to be gleaned from this discussion is that the upper-level movement in Texas was spawned out of a master plan for the entire state that introduced the concept with the 1969 report calling for the creation of an initial group of institutions and ultimately leading to the establishment of several additional units over the next few years. In other words, the upper-level idea was proposed as part of a unified state plan, and based on its early acceptance, it quickly spread throughout the state.

In contrast to Texas, the upper-level institutions in Florida were created individually, in response to the state need for additional institutions of higher education in the heavily populated urban areas of the state. Florida Atlantic University (Boca Raton) was authorized by the legislature in 1961 and

opened in 1964; it was followed first by the University of West Florida (Pensacola), which was authorized in 1963 and opened in 1967, and later by the University of North Florida (Jacksonville) and Florida International University (Miami), both of which were authorized in 1965 and opened in 1972. In the case of Florida, there was no master plan, no single study that assessed the entire state's needs at one point in time and then called for the creation of these new units. Rather, the state moved in an incremental fashion, gradually establishing the new institutions so as to ultimately provide higher education to the growing number of major population centers throughout the state.

Illinois is the final state with multiple upper-level institutions, and the strategy employed there resembled the approach utilized in Texas. The Illinois Board of Higher Education was created in 1961 and had developed an initial "master plan" in the early 1960s; capitalizing on the momentum from that earlier effort, the board followed it in 1966 by issuing a Master Plan–Phase II Report that called for the creation of two new institutions, one in the Springfield area and one in the metropolitan Chicago area.[5] This subsequently led to authorization by the Illinois General Assembly of Sangamon State University in Springfield (which opened in 1970) and Governors State University in Park Forest South (which opened in 1971), both as upper-level institutions.

It would be misleading, however, to attribute exclusive credit for the creation of upper-level universities to state legislatures and state higher education coordinating agencies. In many instances, an equally influential force was the grass-roots activity of local citizen groups, often led by prominent individuals who were willing and able to exercise considerable political clout on behalf of their local community. It is commonly recognized that the decision to locate a new university in a particular city bestows a significant cultural and economic advantage upon that city, a consideration which these local groups clearly understood. In addition, as was indicated in the earlier discussion of Florida, most of the upper-level institutions that were established in the 1960s and 1970s were placed in rapidly growing urban and suburban areas. This is in marked contrast to the tendency in earlier years to locate colleges and universities in rural or small-town settings, and it reflects the importance of access and geographic proximity as modern themes in higher education.

A final factor in the establishment of upper-level institutions that is worthy of mention is the presence of viable two-year colleges in the immediate vicinity which serve as feeders to the upper-level institution. With only a few exceptions, the upper-level institutions created in the 1960s and 1970s were designed to interface with pre-existing two-year institutions, and thereby provide a "capstone" for the pursuit of the baccalaureate degree. Although two-year colleges varied in the degree of political power that they held, their prior presence and successful performance provided a strong argument for creating an upper-level institution and thereby avoiding the costs of duplicating the lower division. Indeed, several current upper-level institutions either share a campus or are located adjacent to a two-year institution. Furthermore, survey data gathered for this study showed that the upper-level institutions identified an average of six two-year colleges that they considered to be feeder institutions. The issue of successful articulation of instructional programs shall be addressed in a later section; for now, the notion that upper-level institutions emerged as a response to the two-year colleges that preceded them is a point that would find little argument.

Resistance to the creation of upper-level universities was not particularly formidable, given the expansionist milieu that existed during the 1960s and early 1970s. Where there was resistance, it focused not on the question of need, but rather on issues such as control and location. For example, in both Florida and Illinois, the large powerful state universities sought to bring certain newly created upper-level institutions under their aegis as branch campuses, an attempt which ultimately failed. In other cases, private universities in the same locale voiced their objections based on fear of competition for enrollment. By and large, however, the resistance was mild, owing to the relatively narrow scope of the upper-level institutions and the overall increasing enrollments at that time.

The upper-level institutions that were created during this period underwent planning processes that did not notably differ from the planning that took place at any new university. In some cases, the original justification documents were developed by outside consultants, such as the Brick Report for SUNY College of Technology[6]; in other cases, planning commissions such as the Brumbaugh Commission at Florida Atlantic University[7] were organized to draw up the initial organizational and academic blueprints. Usually, a two-to-three year period elapsed between legislative authorization and the opening of the institution. During that period the president was appointed, followed by the appointment of key administrators and a small nucleus of faculty who functioned as a team to organize and prepare the institution for the commencement of operations. Opening day enrollments at upper-level institutions varied from 59 at John F. Kennedy University in 1965 to 5,667 at Florida International University in 1972, with a median of 507. Although most opened in temporary quarters, a fortunate few enjoyed permanent new facilities from the outset.

In sum, the upper-level institutions that were created in the 1960s and 1970s had their roots in the expansionist climate of that time. They were properly perceived as a response to the two-year colleges that predated them, and as such did not stir significant controversy. The planning process that preceded their opening was rather conventional, although as the next section will explore, the student body that they would serve certainly was not.

STUDENT CHARACTERISTICS AND SERVICES

A theme that recurs throughout this study concerns the perception by upper-level institutions that they are unlike other universities. Moreover, the differences manifested by upper-level institutions in such areas as clientele, program, and structure are often viewed as troubling to those who lead these institutions. Indeed, as shall be examined later, many of the changes that upper-level administrators are currently attempting to implement can be understood in the context of their desire to resemble other universities more closely.

Against this backdrop, then, it is appropriate to examine the profile of the upper-level student body as well as the services and activities that are provided for them by the institution. Although most upper-level institutions carefully track the demographic and enrollment patterns of their own students, there has been little attempt in the literature to date to analyze systematically the upper-level student body as a whole. Various informal, descriptive accounts have typically used the following six words: 1) older, 2) married, 3) employed, 4) evening, 5) part-time, and 6) commuting. The current study sought to gather specific data to verify the accuracy of these descriptors. Information from twenty-one institutions for the academic year 1977-78 did indeed confirm this profile of the upper-level student body. (See Appendix-Section B.) The median full-time/part-time distribution was thirty-two percent full-time and sixty-eight percent part-time. Only one quarter of the campuses had residential facilities, and of those, only an average of fourteen percent of the students lived on campus. The median age was thirty-one, and the median number of semester credit hours per student was eight. Finally, the median percentage employed was eighty-seven percent.

What implications can be drawn from such a student profile? The case can be argued that the most critical characteristic of the upper-level student body is its *commuting* nature. According to this line of thought, the presence of a commuting student body has a potentially negative impact on the intellectual and cultural life of a campus, owing to the less than full-time commitment of students for whose time work and family responsibilities compete. Furthermore, the commuting student usually suffers from reduced opportunity for important socialization experiences that are more readily available to residential students. Much of the criticism voiced by administrators and faculty regarding the diminished potential for intellectual and social growth among students at upper-level institutions is in actuality more an indictment of the shortcomings of commuter institutions than it is a statement of the shortcomings of upper-level institutions. The fact that a considerable number of upper-level administrators would like either to build or expand residential facilities on their campuses demonstrates the strength of their desire to address this problem and thereby improve the collegial atmosphere of their campuses.

The second important notion to be derived from the data on upper-level student bodies concerns the *seriousness of purpose* of upper-level students. Although freshmen and sophomores are typically indecisive on such matters as choice of major and choice of career, and fluctuate in level of motivation and effort, the upper-level student brings to the institution a clearer sense of purpose and a greater degree of self-directed behavior. By and large, the respondents to the survey indicated that it was their perception that students at upper-level institutions were more degree-oriented than students elsewhere.

Upper-level students realize that changes in academic plans cause them to incur penalties in terms of time that may be particularly harsh for older students, a factor which contributes to their enhanced seriousness of purpose.

The final characteristic worthy of mention concerns the *place-bound* nature of the upper-level student body. For all practical purposes, an overwhelming number of students at these institutions reside in the communities immediately surrounding the school. In most cases, only a very small minority of the student body relocates from distant areas. The size of the population of the region surrounding the institution is therefore a critical measure of the future potential growth of the school, and bodes ill for those upper-level institutions that are situated in small urban areas.

Having drawn a composite portrait of the upper-level student body, which differs in certain significant ways from the student body at traditional universities, and having examined the implications of these differences, one may next consider the nature and extent of student services and activities at upper-level institutions. One can reasonably expect that the scale and range of services is largely a function of the size of the student body at a given institution. Table 2 reveals the historical headcount enrollments for each upper-level institution in this study as well as total growth. In 1977, the median headcount enrollment was 2,024. Among those services that demand greater attention and resources at upper-level institutions are financial aid, recruitment, counseling, and placement; in contrast, student government, student activities, and housing typically require a less substantial institutional commitment.

Financial aid assumes increased importance for two separate reasons. First, students at upper-level institutions typically come from less affluent families than students elsewhere. Second, a significant number of upper-level students, particularly those who are older and married, consider themselves independent from their parents and, consequently, not in a position to tap them for financial support.

Recruitment is essential to the continued vitality of the upper-level institution; it must extend to the junior college, the technical school, the four-year university, and the community at large, indeed wherever potential students who qualify for junior-level status or above may be located. As such, recruitment is a complex function that consumes considerable resources and energy.

Counseling is another student service that is central to the upper-level institution. Academic advisement is especially critical because of the number of older students returning to college after long periods of interruption. Personal counseling focuses on issues pertaining to the student's need to balance the often conflicting requirements of work, family, and school. As such, it is more oriented toward "family-adult" concerns than "social-developmental" issues. Finally, the placement function is usually very well-developed at these institutions, in recognition of the serious approach to career development that is characteristic of upper-level students.

The University of North Florida is a particularly good example of an institution that has responded creatively to these special needs of upper-level students. It operates an Academic and Career Advisement Program in which certain faculty members are appointed half time as classroom instructors and half time as academic and career advisors. As a group, they receive intensive training in advising techniques and current information about university programs and procedures. This policy of release time is a tangible demonstra-

tion of the university's recognition of the importance of these student services.

Just as certain student services are emphasized at upper-level institutions, others receive relatively less attention. Responses from the survey revealed that there are fewer student organizations and activities at upper-level institutions; those that do exist usually have smaller memberships and lower participation rates. As previously discussed, this attenuated level of activity is a common feature of commuter schools, because of the tendency of students to satisfy social needs and cultivate friendships in settings other than the university. The virtual absence of intercollegiate athletics and the very limited intramural athletic programs are other manifestations of this same phenomenon. The upper-level universities in Florida are an exception here, with their well-developed athletic facilities allowing them to offer a more diversified program (and thereby compete for students with the other public universities in Florida).

Student government is another neglected area. Although there are a few exceptions, student associations are usually weak or non-existent, owing to their inability to generate a consistent level of interest and participation. Once again, the Florida institutions are in a somewhat different position, inasmuch as the state has given these student associations the power to allocate student activity and service fees.

Finally, as noted earlier, only one quarter of the upper-level institutions provide even limited student housing. Many upper-level administrators believe that if they were able to rectify this situation, they would then be in a position to enhance the quality of many other student services and activities, and thereby dramatically improve the collegial atmosphere of their campus. However, the current political and financial climate in most states makes the building or expansion of residential facilities by the institution highly unlikely. One can only conclude with the same point that introduced this section: the desire of upper-level institutions to resemble other universities more closely. In the realm of student residence, however, that desire will probably not be fulfilled.

TABLE 2

Headcount Enrollments in Upper-Level Institutions*

Institution	1964	1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971	1972	1973	1974	1975	1976	1977
SUNY College of Technology						293	442	576	613	911	2,198	2,928	2,852	2,840
Corpus Christi State University										969	1,603	2,005	2,253	2,495
University of West Florida				1,404	3,072	3,382	3,754	3,894	4,323	4,305	4,906	5,224	4,978	5,017
John F. Kennedy University		059	093	119	182	260	337	235	320	502	439	494	663	860
Garfield Senior College									477	438	507	572	586	701
University of Texas at Tyler										507	874	1,215	1,499	1,795
Laredo State University							285	455	652	636	745	783	757	793
Pan American University at Brownsville										397	433	546	702	1,020
University of Texas of the Permian Basin										1,112	1,352	1,432	1,471	1,575
East Texas State University at Texarkana									323	535	503	1,048	1,064	1,151
University of Houston Victoria Campus										356	607	655	757	694
University of Houston at Clear Lake City											1,069	2,621	4,032	4,831
Athens State College												862	1,068	1,314
West Oahu College													140	201
University of North Florida									1,997	3,176	3,930	4,353	4,223	4,252
Florida Atlantic University	867	2,392	3,482	4,144	4,338	5,057	5,249	5,732	5,681	5,632	6,647	6,907	6,526	6,917
Metropolitan State University										150	750	1,500	2,055	2,024
Sangamon State University							811	1,569	2,327	2,860	3,387	3,977	3,792	3,612
Governors State University								695	1,230	2,230	2,944	4,579	3,600	3,814
Florida International University									5,667	8,807	9,580	10,608	9,996	10,687
Penn State Capitol Campus			122	513	1,002	1,647	1,574	2,005	2,190	2,143	2,303	2,579	2,458	2,604
University of South Florida (3 regional campuses)					629	821	1,094	1,266	1,438	1,496	2,162	3,032	3,119	3,025
Totals	867	2,451	3,697	6,180	9,223	11,460	13,546	16,427	27,238	37,162	46,939	57,920	58,591	62,242

* Does not include University of Texas at Dallas, Sul Ross State University Uvalde Study Center, or University of Baltimore

ACADEMIC ISSUES

At the heart of any inquiry into the nature of a university or group of universities is an examination of its academic thrust. Ideally at least, a university's identity is first and foremost shaped by the quality and range of its academic programs. This section seeks to identify and explore those academic issues that are of particular concern to upper-level institutions.

Articulation with Two-Year Institutions

It is appropriate to begin by examining the relationship between upper-level institutions and the community and junior colleges that serve as feeders, because it is this "two-plus-two" arrangement that differentiates the upper-level institution from the rest of higher education. To be certain, the majority of four-year institutions also serve a transfer clientele, but only the upper-level institution (at the undergraduate level) serves transfers *exclusively*. Upper-level institutions have therefore devoted considerable attention to the development of articulation policies and procedures that ease the student's transition from the community college.

In addressing the larger issue of articulation, the upper-level institution must tackle a wide range of sub-issues. Several of these concern student status and assessment of performance: 1) standards of eligibility for admission, 2) determination of transfer of credit, 3) resolution of individual deficiencies, 4) appeals procedures, and 5) rules governing concurrent enrollment at two institutions. In Florida, a 1971 statewide Articulation Agreement between the state universities (including upper-level institutions) and the public community colleges guarantees admission to upper division study at a state university to individuals who have earned the Associate in Arts degree from a Florida public community college. The Associate in Arts degree is considered to be adequate evidence that the student has completed the general education requirements of the baccalaureate degree. Many upper-level institutions outside of Florida have similar admissions requirements, although they are determined institutionally rather than on a statewide basis.

However, it is after a student is admitted that the administrative burden can become particularly heavy. Students at upper-level institutions tend to arrive with several transcripts from different schools attended over an extended period of time; furthermore, their prior records often contain specific academic deficiencies that require resolution. In short, because the first contact the upper-level institution has with students is at best halfway through their undergraduate careers, the administrative staff is constantly required to render individualized judgments and recommend individualized steps to resolve problems. Although years of experience in these matters have sharpened the institution's ability to interpret and apply consistent standards, the whole area of performance assessment is tremendously expensive and time-consuming for the upper-level university.

A second aspect of the relationship between junior colleges and upper-level universities concerns inter-institutional mechanisms and cooperative ventures. Probably the most formalized relationship can be found at the University of Houston at Clear Lake City, where the original enabling legislation mandated the creation of a permanent advisory committee comprised of the presidents (or designated representatives) of the eight surrounding junior colleges. In other areas of the country, various consortia have been established among neighboring institutions to open the lines of communica-

tion and encourage joint activities and academic programs. In Florida, several upper-level institutions offer off-campus courses on the neighboring junior college campuses, and conversely, provide facilities for the junior colleges to do the same on the upper-level campus. Finally, a noteworthy example of the linkage between upper-level institutions and junior colleges is the publication by Sangamon State University of a journal entitled *Community College Frontiers*, which is devoted to an examination of the issues and trends that affect the two-year college sector.

There is a final dimension to the relationship between junior colleges and upper-level institutions that is even more critical than admission and transfer procedures or inter-institutional arrangements. This dimension is the *academic* interface between these two types of institutions—the process of designing a two-plus-two curriculum in such a way that the final product reflects a unified academic program for the student who chooses this route for an undergraduate education. The process is an imperfect one because students do not always partake of all of the pieces of the unified program or, alternatively, partake on a piecemeal basis over an extended period of time. The situation is exacerbated by the presence of certain negative attitudes and jurisdictional disputes. Some faculty members at upper-level institutions resent what they perceive to be the inferior qualifications and abilities of their junior college counterparts, an attitude that is heightened when junior college transfers whom they judge underprepared arrive in their classrooms. A second source of tension centers on the distinction between lower-division and upper-division courses. As in any enterprise that requires movement from one institution to another, the border that separates the two is ambiguous. Disagreements over the proper location of certain intermediate courses have led to accusations of territorial infringement. There are no easy solutions to this problem; ultimately they must depend upon the good will and efforts of those involved.

However, where there is exemplary cooperation between upper-level institutions and junior colleges on matters of academic articulation, the cases are worthy of mention. Each of the Florida upper-level institutions issues an annual "Counseling Manual," an impressive publication that provides detailed information on lower- and upper-division course requirements for every possible academic major at that upper-level institution. At SUNY College of Technology at Utica/Rome, the interface between the four associate's degrees that the institution recognizes (Associate of Arts, Associate of Science, Associate of Applied Science, and Associate of Occupational Studies) and the three bachelor's degrees that it offers (Bachelor of Arts, Bachelor of Science, and Bachelor of Professional Studies) has been translated into a series of graphic equations that indicate the permissible distribution of arts and science courses and professional courses across the two institutions (lower-division and upper-division), thereby clearly communicating to the student the different requirements of these various degrees.

Balance between Innovative and Traditional Approaches

Two-year college relations have been examined in rather extended detail because of the centrality of this issue to the academic identity and program of the upper-level institution. Another academic issue worthy of examination is the attempt to achieve balance between innovative and traditional approaches to instruction. Despite their brief histories, upper-level institutions in many instances appear to have experienced two discernible phases of growth. Many upper-level institutions, particularly those that began in the

late 1960s, wholeheartedly embraced at the outset the notion of innovation as their guiding spirit in both curricular and organizational matters. In the initial stages, it was not uncommon to find considerable utilization of self-paced courses, individualized instruction, educational technology, pass-fail grading systems, and credit for "life experience." While such innovative techniques can and do have educational merit, this experimental spirit was frequently accompanied by some negative by-products. For example, some upper-level institutions found themselves with unusually high levels of incompletes, haphazard enforcement of admissions requirements, inconsistent grading standards, questionable procedures for the awarding of credit, and serious problems with suspension and probation.

In the realm of academic organization, many upper-level institutions began with either non-traditional inter-departmental or even non-departmental structures, which were accompanied by profound decentralization of the academic decision-making process. Programs and courses were given unorthodox titles, degree requirements were stated in vague terms, and there was a tremendous amount of ambiguity and discontinuity in the curriculum. At one institution, each college independently published its own quite different catalogue, and there was no unified approach to courses and degrees.

With the passage of time, many curricular and organizational changes have slowly become evident. In recent years, one has begun to notice a return to traditional forms of instruction, with less dependence upon educational technology, stricter enforcement of academic standards, and greater attention by the institution to clear articulation of course objectives and degree requirements. Faculties that were originally organized quite informally have begun to develop departmental or quasi-departmental structures, particularly as issues of promotion and tenure become important on a given campus. In short, one observes an initial phase in which an institution was most willing to experiment and innovate followed by a more recent period in which a return to more traditional forms of instruction and organization is evident.

In this regard, the experience of Florida Atlantic University provides a compelling case study.[8] Recommendations from the original planning commission called for a major commitment to the use of educational technology, which resulted in a significant initial investment in a television studio and learning resources center. Yet, this vision of a technology-based approach to instruction went largely unrealized, owing to a series of major obstacles that ultimately caused the institution to adopt more traditional modes of instruction. The problems included 1) faculty resistance stemming from their own unfamiliarity with this approach, 2) lack of release time to prepare the new materials, 3) student resistance to the replacement of live instructors with electronic equipment, and 4) lack of adequate funding. In sum, the Florida Atlantic University experience demonstrates the need to recognize the attitudes of those involved as the institution attempts to balance innovative and traditional approaches to instruction.

The content of the curriculum at upper-level institutions today also reflects the balance between innovative and traditional areas of inquiry. In aggregate terms, the most popular disciplines and those that therefore demand the greatest outlay of resources are business administration, education, and arts and sciences. These curricular emphases are consistent with the patterns of student choice at other types of universities, particularly with respect to the recent resurgence of interest in business administration.

However, several upper-level institutions feature in addition special academic programs that shape the identity of the institution. For example,

Sangamon State University, located in the capital city of Springfield, Illinois, is recognized as the state's "public affairs" university, a special mission mandated by the Illinois General Assembly when it established the institution in 1970. Students integrate the public affairs mission into their experience through special colloquia and internships, and faculty conduct applied research through the four Public Affairs Centers: 1) the Illinois Legislative Studies Center, 2) the Center for the Study of Middle-sized Cities, 3) the Center for Policy Studies and Program Evaluation, and 4) the Legal Studies Center. At SUNY College of Technology at Utica/Rome, the word "technology" is broadly defined to mean the application of science to the problems of society; toward that objective, the institution has designed a series of degree programs in such areas as human services, health services management, criminal justice, nursing, and business and public management. The University of Houston at Clear Lake City is one upper-level institution that has retained its original interdisciplinary thrust, with its Masters Degree program in Studies of the Future being perhaps the best example of this approach. Finally, Metropolitan State University in St. Paul, Minnesota, is probably the most non-traditional upper-level institution, with its policy of academic credit for prior experience, its heavy reliance on part-time faculty from the community, and the extension of the campus to a wide range of learning centers (libraries, museums, and the like) throughout the Twin Cities metropolitan area.

Addition of a Lower Division

The final issue to be addressed concerns the attempt by certain upper-level institutions to add the lower division, so that they may have more complete control over the baccalaureate education of their students. This, of course, represents the boldest challenge to the essential concept upon which the upper-level institutions were originally founded. It is another manifestation of the desire to "gravitate toward the mean" which characterizes certain upper-level institutions today.

This issue survived its most severe test in Florida during the 1980 legislative session, where only a gubernatorial veto prevented the upper-level institutions from beginning the process of adding the lower division. The original impetus for this fundamental change was provided by Florida International University (FIU) where the faculty played an important leadership role in arguing the case for a four-year institution. The FIU faculty proposal originally called for the creation of a small "academically select" lower division, but this was perceived by the competing institution, Miami-Dade Junior College, as the opening of the wedge into full four-year status. A team of consultants and a legislative commission subsequently studied the potential educational and economic impact of converting all of the upper-level institutions to four-year status. When the Florida Legislature convened in early 1980, several alternative proposals (addressing other issues as well) were introduced. As one might expect, the issue attracted much public attention and became highly politicized. The legislature ultimately passed a bill that, among other things, called for the merger of the University of North Florida with the University of Florida and added the lower division to the University of North Florida, the University of West Florida, and Florida International University. In the end, Governor Robert Graham vetoed the entire higher education bill, thus preserving the identity of Florida's upper-level institutions.

At the other end of the programmatic spectrum, and on a much more limited scale, are the upper-level institutions that currently offer only bachelor's degrees and wish to begin to offer master's degrees, and others that currently offer master's degrees and would like to initiate limited doctoral offerings. Whether it be expansion at the lower level or at the graduate level, however, the pattern seems to be quite similar: the upper-level institution seeks through expansion of programmatic offerings to make itself more closely resemble other universities.

BUDGETARY AND FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS

Just as the previous sections have identified certain distinctive characteristics of the student body at upper-level institutions as well as the academic issues that particularly concern them, this one examines the unique budgetary and financial considerations that confront this group of universities. Although an important area, this subject was not investigated in the same depth as the other topics because of the difficulty of gathering complete and comparable data. Section D of the Appendix presents some very basic budget data; the discussion, however, will focus more on the issues raised by the numbers than the numbers themselves.

Clearly, the issue of cost efficiency is the one that is most central to the viability of the upper-level movement. It is readily apparent that the per-student costs in upper-level institutions are greater than comparable figures at four-year institutions for reasons that shall be enumerated shortly. However, this cost differential must be considered in the context in which these institutions were originally established. It should be remembered that the vast majority of the upper-level institutions that began in the 1960s and 1970s were located in areas where two-year institutions were already operating. The rationale for creating an *upper-level* institution was precisely to avoid the duplication of the lower division; given that constraint, it usually reflected the most financially prudent course of action to follow.

At the time when the decision to create an upper-level institution was being made, the proponents in most instances prepared a case statement that demonstrated need by providing enrollment projections over a five- to fifteen-year period. In retrospect, it is clear that these early projections were usually cast with an eye toward the political necessity of accentuating the enrollment potential and, therefore, did not always reflect rigorous forecasting techniques. What are commonly cited today as enrollment shortfalls (median headcount was 2,024 in 1977) are at least in part a reflection of unrealistic projections at the front end.

Whatever the reasons, however, it is a fact that most upper-level institutions have not yet reached a point of "critical mass" in tems of either student headcount or student full-time equivalents (FTE) and, as such, have not been able to realize any significant economies of scale. Certain academic, financial, and student services are necessary to the operation of a university regardless of its size. The plight of upper-level institutions is exacerbated by the large numbers of part-time students who require equivalent student services and record maintenance, but who do not generate semester credit hours equivalent to full-time students. Furthermore, many upper-level institutions offer substantial evening programs, which require staffing of extra sections and cause additional building maintenance expense.

Among all of these factors, however, there are two that emerge as the most important in explaining the difference in cost between upper-level institutions and four-year universities. The first is the absence of large lecture classes that are commonly found in the lower division; in four-year universities, freshman and sophomore level courses effectively "subsidize" the smaller junior and senior level courses, a luxury unavailable to upper-level institutions. Second, the inappropriateness of using graduate students as teaching fellows to staff upper-division courses prevents the institution from realizing significant cost savings. In short, the instructional staffing requirements of upper-level institutions are, by their very nature, more expensive than those of comparable four-year universities.

Certain states recognize these operational distinctions through the use of formulas with different rates for upper-level institutions and minimum levels for small institutions. However, according to most upper-level institutions, the compensatory treatment has not fully addressed the needs. The institutions themselves have been somewhat able to contain instructional personnel costs through the use of part-time adjunct faculty; in addition, the faculty rank distribution, on the whole, is lower at upper-level institutions than at four-year universities because of their relative newness and the tendency to hire at the junior levels.

Finally, Table 3 presents budget and enrollment data from nineteen upper-level institutions that allow the reader to calculate a series of ratios that address the issue of cost per student. Since the budget data are annual whereas the enrollment data cover only one semester, the ratios that can be derived are meaningful only in a relative context. Although the analysis is imperfect, it does demonstrate the tremendous variation in resource availability among upper-level institutions, with the most abundant (or expensive, depending upon one's perspective!) institution having approximately three times the resources of the least abundant. Readers are left to draw their own conclusions.

TABLE 3

Budget* and Enrollment** Data

	Budget		FTE			Headcount			% Part-time
	E & G	Total	Undergrad	Grad	Total	Undergrad	Grad	Total	
Governors State University	12.85	13.44	970	1,145	2,115	1,683	2,131	3,814	77%
Sangamon State University	11.25	12.50	1,263	893	2,156	2,097	1,515	3,612	70
University of Texas of the Permian Basin	4.65	5.07	719	156	875	891	684	1,575	81
University of West Florida	14.15	19.25	3,224	645	3,869	4,373	706	5,079	46
West Oahu College	.53	.53	108	0	108	201	0	201	62
East Texas State University at Texarkana	3.35	3.35	432	288	720	801	350	1,151	76
University of North Florida	10.16	12.24	2,007	686	2,693	3,441	811	4,252	68
Florida Atlantic University	17.88	22.18	4,062	876	4,938	6,052	1,028	7,080	50
University of Houston Victoria Campus	1.91	1.96	343	122	465	365	329	694	84
Corpus Christi State University	5.75	6.48	1,039	478	1,563	1,339	1,041	2,495	64
Florida International University	26.00	30.39	6,348	1,091	7,439	8,591	2,357	10,948	34
Laredo State University	1.93	2.01	421	104	525	,504	289	793	64
Athens State College	2.34	2.94	780	0	780	1,314	0	1,314	53
University of Texas at Tyler	4.41	4.72	962	309	1,271	1,233	562	1,795	60
SUNY College of Technology	3.83	4.78	1,530	214	1,740	2,209	631	2,840	60
University of Houston at Clear Lake City	7.38	8.11	1,695	1,570	3,265	1,790	3,041	4,831	75
Pan American University at Brownsville	1.51	1.54	454	177	631	605	415	1,020	72
Metropolitan State University	1.86	1.86	865	0	865	2,024	0	2,024	75
John F. Kennedy University	1.17	1.17	105	515	620	126	573	880	50

* Budget data for 1977-1978
**Enrollment data for Fall 1977

SUMMARY AND PROSPECTS

In the final section, it is worthwhile to reflect on the broader implications of the findings in this study and to offer a brief commentary on the future viability of upper-level institutions in the United States. Looking first at the positive side of the ledger, it can be argued that the distinct structure of the upper-level institution provides students with one more option from which to choose a college or university. As noted earlier, there are relatively few *types* of institutions of higher education in this country; to that extent, then, the presence of upper-level institutions promotes diversity. Second, upper-level institutions have successfully focused their resources and energy on meeting the special needs of non-traditional students: those who are older, employed, married, part-time, and place-bound. In addition, upper-level institutions have fashioned professionally-oriented curricula, which together with well-developed placement offices, have been effective in securing appropriate employment opportunities for their graduates. Finally, the faculty that have been attracted to upper-level universities are primarily young, positively oriented toward teaching, and eager to participate in the shaping of the identity of a new institution.

However, the negative forces that affect upper-level institutions tend to neutralize and in some cases outweigh the positive factors. First and foremost, from a purely educational perspective, it is difficult to argue that the two-plus-two experience is more viable than that offered by a traditional four-year institution. Critical considerations such as student socialization, curricular continuity, environmental stability, and the capacity for meaningful faculty-student relationships all can suffer when a student transfers from one institution to another. To be certain, only approximately half of today's college students graduate from the institution in which they originally enroll, so the upper-level institution is hardly unique in this matter of student mobility. Yet, feelings of permanence during college and subsequent loyalty to the institution after graduation are difficult to cultivate when the educational experience is bisected.

In addition, the upper-level institutions face many of the same problems that plague all of higher education today. Enrollment declines nationwide have resulted in more severe competition for the non-traditional student market from which upper-level institutions customarily draw. State appropriations in real dollars have decreased over the past several years, a condition which places special hardship on the newer institutions, which are still attempting to broaden the scope of their academic program. Finally, the failure of many upper-level institutions to reach a critical mass of FTE students has caused them to operate with less than optimal efficiency. In this context, then, it is not surprising that although twenty-five upper-level institutions were created between 1964 and 1976, none has been established during the past four years.

What conditions can be identified that would enhance the likelihood of survival and indeed prosperity of upper-level institutions? Quite obviously, those which are located in major urban areas enjoy a substantial built-in market advantage, owing to the place-bound nature of the student body. In addition, the presence of a group of strong two-year colleges in the immediate vicinity is essential to the sustained flow of students to the upper-level institution. As has been discussed fully, it is most important for these two types of institutions to be able to design well-articulated academic programs

and policies; their success in this realm can have a major impact on the academic viability of the upper-level institution.

There is one approach to academic program development that has not been fully explored to date, but which holds particular promise in the near future. The possibility of designing carefully prescribed programs that lead to both a bachelor's and master's degree in the same discipline would appear to be an especially attractive option for upper-level universities. Students entering at the junior level would know at that point that they could reasonably expect to earn both degrees upon the completion of the equivalent of three to four years of full-time academic work. This type of program is most appealing to the goal-oriented student because of the early assurance it provides. From the institution's perspective, it offers the opportunity for more complete control over the student's educational destiny and enhances the likelihood of student participation in the life of the institution.

What type of leadership is appropriate for the upper-level institution of the 1980s? Examination of the presidencies of upper-level institutions reveals a pattern similar to the one noted earlier in the discussion of curricular evolution. Many upper-level institutions began with presidents who functioned primarily as visionaries of an academic mission, articulators of an educational idea, and interpreters to the public of the unique educational opportunities afforded by their new institution. However, many of these founding presidents encountered difficulty in implementing their educational philosophy and mission for their institution, either because their visions were greater than the available resources, enrollments did not materialize, or internal problems developed. Nevertheless, these presidents played a critical role in developing institutional character and establishing priorities and directions for academic programs. Many of these initial presidents have in time (usually five to eight years) been followed by second presidents who, in contrast, perceive their role as consolidators, as program implementers, and as individuals who must translate an originally noble idea into a workable academic program structure for an institution of higher education in the late 1970s and 1980s. It is this second type of president who would appear to be the most appropriate to direct upper-level institutions today.

In the final analysis, two fundamental issues face upper-level institutions today. One is the need for currently existing institutions to balance two opposing tendencies: the desire to carve out a unique niche in the landscape of higher education versus the desire to resemble other universities more closely. There are compelling reasons for and attractive features to each of these strategies. At what point on the spectrum this tension is ultimately reconciled is a decision that must be made by each individual upper-level institution.

The second issue concerns the future of the upper-level movement itself. This paper has presented both the benefits and drawbacks of this type of institution to demonstrate that the future has a mixed prognosis. Just as the junior college movement required decades to mature and become fully accepted in American higher education, it may still be too early in the modern upper-level experiment to draw conclusions about its long-term viability.

NOTES

[1]*A Classification of Institutions of Higher Education*, Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education, (Berkeley, CA: 1976) p. XII.

[2]Robert Altman, *The Upper Division College*, (San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, 1970) p. 8.

[3]*Ibid.*

[4]*Challenge for Excellence*, Coordinating Board, Texas College and University System, (Austin, TX: 1969).

[5]*A Master Plan–Phase II for Higher Education in Illinois*, Illinois Board of Higher Education, (Springfield, IL: 1966) p. 11.

[6]Michael Brick, *The Need for Higher Education Facilities in the Mohawk Valley*. A Report to SUNY by Oneida County Legislature, 1964.

[7]*Report of the Planning Commission for a New University at Boca Raton*, Board of Control of Florida, (Tallahassee, FL: 1961).

[8]Ruth Weinstock, "Default of a Dream . . . or, Whatever Happened to Florida Atlantic University?" *Planning for Higher Education*, 5, 3 (June 1976).

APPENDIX

STATISTICAL PROFILE OF UPPER-LEVEL INSTITUTIONS*

Section A—General Information

Control:

Public	19
Private	2

Type:

Autonomous Unit Within Multi-Campus System	11
Free Standing Institution	7
Extension Center	2
Other	1

Reporting Relationship:

To Chief Executive of Multi-Campus System	9
To State Board of Regents	6
To Private Board of Regents or Trustees	2
To President of Campus	2
To State Board of Education and State Superintendent	1
To University Provost	1

Median Number of Two-Year Colleges Considered To Be Feeder Institutions 6

*Figures are based on responses from twenty-one upper-level institutions.

Section B-Student Data (Fall 1977)

1. Total Headcount

Median	2,024
Mean	2,838
Range	201 – 10,948

2. Undergraduate Headcount

Median	1,339
Mean	1,986
Range	126 – 8,591

3. Graduate Headcount (N=18)

Median	695
Mean	957
Range	50 – 3,041

4. Sex Distribution (Median)

Male	48%
Female	52%

Range:	Male	37% – 74%
	Female	26% – 63%

5. Full-Time/Part-Time Distribution (Median)

Full-Time	32%
Part-Time	68%

Range:	Full-Time	19% – 66%
	Part-Time	34% – 81%

6. Total FTE

Median	1,271
Mean	1,844
Range	108 – 7,439

7. Undergraduate FTE

Median	962
Mean	1,386
Range	105 – 6,348

8. Graduate FTE (N=18)

Median	394
Mean	533
Range	26 – 1,570

9. Percentage Employed (Median) 87%

10. Residential Facilities on Campus

Yes	5 (24%)
No	16 (76%)

Percentage of Students Living on Campus

Median	14%
Range	3% – 26%

11. Percentage of Undergraduates Receiving Baccalaureate Degree Within Two Years

Median	50%
Range	10% – 90%

12. Percentage of Undergraduates Transferring from Two-Year Institutions

Median	66%
Range	20% – 98%

13. Percentage of Undergraduates Transferring from Four-Year Institutions

Median	28%
Range	12% – 50%

14. Median Age

Undergraduate	28
Graduate	31
Total	31

15. Median Number of Semester Credit Hours

Undergraduate	10
Graduate	5
Total	8

16. Number of Undergraduate Degrees Awarded During Calendar Year

Median	366
Mean	500
Range	12 – 2,147

17. Number of Graduate Degrees Awarded During 1977-78 Calendar Year

Median	116
Mean	213
Range	6 – 632

18. Year of Opening

1964	1	1971	2
1965	1	1972	3
1966	1	1973	6
1967	1	1974	1
1969	1	1975	1
1970	2	1976	1

19. **Beginning Enrollment**

Median	507
Mean	896
Range	59 – 5,667

20. **Total Population of Area Living Within Reasonable Commuting Distance**

Median	535,000
Mean	1,237,000
Range	75,000 – 5,000,000

Section C—Faculty Data (1977-1978)

1. **Faculty FTE**

Median	70
Mean	119
Range	15 – 412

2. **Full-Time/Part-Time Distribution (Median)**

Full-Time		80%
Part-Time		20%
Range:	Full-Time	2% – 99%
	Part-Time	1% – 98%

3. **Sex Distribution (Median)**

Male		75%
Female		25%
Range:	Male	57% – 94%
	Female	6% – 43%

4. **Faculty Rank Distribution**

	Median	Range
Full Professor	19%	0% – 31%
Associate Professor	36%	0% – 57%
Assistant Professor	35%	25% – 75%
Instructor	9%	3% – 25%

5. **Faculty Salary Distribution**

	Median	Range
Full Professor	$23,200	$21,000 – 25,900
Associate Professor	19,200	17,000 – 21,300
Assistant Professor	15,800	14,800 – 18,000
Instructor	13,000	11,300 – 16,100

6. Percentage with Doctoral Degrees

Median	81%
Range	40% – 93%

7. Percentage with Tenure

Median	40%
Range	0% – 83%

Section D–Budget Data (1977-1978)

1. Total Education and General Budget

Median	$4,172,000
Mean	$6,843,000
Range	$527,000 – $26,000,000

2. Percentage of Education and General Budget Committed to Personnel

Median	72%
Range	46% – 82%

3. Source of Education and General Funds

State	82%
Federal Government	1%
Student Tuition and Fees	12%
Private	1%
Other Sources	1%

4. Total Auxiliary Enterprise Budget (N=15)

Median	$475,000
Range	$35,000 – $2,745,000

5. Total Amount of External Research Funds (N=11)

Median	$941,000
Range	$13,000 – $3,017,000

6. Overall Total Operating Budget

Median	$4,805,000
Mean	$7,968,000
Range	$527,000 – $30,388,000